

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Minor amendments have been made to the claims to provide consistency throughout the specification and claims and are not intended to narrow the scope of the present teachings. The amendments to the claims contained herein are at least equivalent to the originally filed claim scope and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION AND ABSTRACT AMENDMENTS

The specification and abstract have been amended to provide consistent reference to the recliner arm. Previously item (70) was referred to as both a recliner arm and a recliner disk. The application has been amended to consistently refer to item (70) as a recliner arm. Because this feature was disclosed in the drawings and specification as originally filed, no new matter has been presented.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102 AND 103

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,899, hereinafter "Yu"). Claims 5-6, 9-10, 15-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu in view of Niimi et al. (U.S. App. No. US 2003/0127898). Claims 21 and 22 stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu in view of Sugimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,568,756). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 disclose “a recliner arm supported by said slide-pin subassembly for pivotal displacement relative thereto, wherein said recliner arm includes an engagement edge engaging said slide-pin subassembly and adapted to lock said slide-pin subassembly in said first and second positions.” The Examiner maintains that Yu includes a recliner disc (102) including an engagement edge (134). However, what the Examiner considers Yu’s recliner disc is actually a cam that is coupled to a recliner mechanism. Applicant’s recliner arm locks the slide-pin subassembly in first and second positions while the cam in Yu merely biases a lock pin. Thus, Yu does not appear to disclose “a recliner arm adapted to lock a slide-pin subassembly.”

Claims 2-10 and 12-22 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, these claims should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1 and 11. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 16, 2005

By: 

Michael Malinzak
Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MAM/JMP/ca